



To: Task Force Members

From: Cozy Hannula | CH

Date: August 29, 2019

Comm. No: 9999

Subject: Independent School District #720
Community Facilities Task Force Meeting #3
August 22, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Task Force Members:

Kevin Bjerken, Building Administrator	kbjerken@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Ed Zeimet, Buildings and Ground Manager	ezeimet@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Tim Brophy, Community Member	tbrophy01@gmail.com
Astrid KammueLLer, Community Member	akammueLLer@comcast.net
Katie Lee, Community Member	ck_1107@live.com
Kay Strand, Community Member	kstrand@hotmail.com
Bryan Drozd, District Administrator	bdrozd@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Allison Gill, Early Childhood Teacher	allison.m.hirsch@gmail.com
Corinne Doherty, Elementary Teacher	cdoherty@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Natalie Weatherman, Middle Level Teacher	nweather@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Dan Lehman, Staff	dlehman@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Bradly McGarr, Staff	bmcgarr@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Matt McKeand, School Board	mmckeand@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Kristi Peterson, School Board	kpeterson@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Judi Tomczik, School Board	jtomczik@shakopee.k12.mn.us

Absentees:

Aaron Kahnke, Community Member	kahnkea@gmail.com
Richard Stevens, Community Member	richstevens35@gmail.com
TJ Hendrickson, Secondary Teacher	thendric@shakopee.k12.mn.us

District Resources:

Dave Orlowsky, Assistant Superintendent	dorlowsky@shakopee.k12.mn.us
Mike Redmond, Superintendent	mredmond@shakopee.k12.mn.us



Facilitators:

Scott McQueen, Wold Architects and Engineers	smcqueen@woldae.com
Ben Beery, Wold Architects and Engineers	bbeery@woldae.com
Cozy Hannula, Wold Architects and Engineers	channula@woldae.com

Discussion Topics:

- A. The Shakopee City Planner gave an overview of new development planned in Shakopee in the next few years.
 1. Two main areas of expected growth are the west end and a central area south of 169.
 2. In these developments, there are approximately 200 single-family homes, which could typically include 150 kids.
 3. There is also expected to be development because of the annexation of Jackson Township.
 4. There is likely to be densification, including apartments, in order to fill a void in the market in the last few years.
 - a. Market for apartments tends to be couples or single people.
 - b. Families might rent short-term while looking for housing.
 - c. Some families who have moved might rent to see if the market changes.
 - d. Some new development is focusing on older residents, which could increase the amount of single-family houses on the market.
 5. The population of Shakopee is projected to go from 42,000 (current) to 65,000 in 2040.
 6. Most communities are aging out to be primarily single-family but Shakopee is predicted to stay younger due to predicted stable job growth.
 7. The City is also seeing an increase in demand for permits for childcare buildings.
 8. Development changes rapidly based on the economy and the market so it is hard to predict exactly how many units will end up being built beyond the next couple of years.
- B. Group discussed how future development relates to enrollment.
 1. New development is needed to maintain enrollment due to families aging-in-place.
 2. Areas of projected growth are in attendance areas for Sweeney, Sun Path, and Eagle Creek.
 3. At its height, Shakopee development was around 1,000 units per year. In the last few years, it has been around 50. It is now starting to get to 100 per year again. Units includes both apartments and single-family.
- C. Wold gave an overview of school maintenance and funding.
- D. Unesco gave an overview of deferred maintenance needs in the District, including CFC and Pearson, and how priorities for LTFM projects are determined.
 1. CFC:
 - a. Building and systems are older, many original to 1948.
 - b. Roof needs replacing.
 - c. Many areas are not accessible.
 2. Pearson:
 - a. Upgrades include:
 - 1) HVAC system.
 - 2) Some exterior upgrades to improve drainage.
 - 3) Interior finishes, including ceiling tiles.
 - 4) Playground is not accessible.



3. It was noted that LTFM cannot add something that is not in the building (e.g. if a building does not have a security system. LTFM funding cannot be used to add it.).
- E. Discussion / Key Takeaways:
1. There was surprise that the cost for deferred maintenance at Pearson was higher than CFC.
 - a. It was noted that:
 - 1) This number includes roof replacement, which has been done since facility analysis.
 - 2) Pearson has more square footage than CFC.
 - 3) Deferred maintenance number does not include any upgrades to improve usability of building.
 2. Group discussed the impact of selling or demolishing CFC on LTFM funding, which is based on building age and size.
 - a. District estimated that without CFC, District would lose \$200,000-\$250,000 in LTFM funding. It was noted that even if a building is taken offline (as was done at Pearson) it is still included for LTFM funding as long as it is owned by the District because maintenance is still required.
 3. Questions was asked how much money is saved with Pearson offline and it was noted that taking a school offline typically saves \$300,000-\$500,000.
- F. Information Requests:
1. Costs to operate CFC and Pearson.
 2. Market/rent value of CFC.

cc: Sarah Koehn, ISD #720
Ashley McCray, ISD #720

skoehn@shakopee.k12.mn.us
amccray@shakopee.k12.mn.us